

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] asked that the pending resolution go over until to-morrow, when I ventured to call his attention to the fact that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] had secured unanimous consent that his resolution should come up in the morning immediately after the morning business, that he had given notice he would address the Senate upon it, and I suggested to the Senator from Tennessee that this resolution should go over until the day after to-morrow, to which he acceded. That was the understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. And that is the understanding of the Senate?

Mr. SPOONER. Let the resolutions go over, Mr. President, until the day after to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Senate, as the Chair understands, that all of these resolutions, except the one offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], shall go over until Friday morning; and the one offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] on yesterday retains its place as a resolution to come up hereafter. It will be displaced to-morrow by the resolution of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. GORMAN. It will; and therefore I ask that it may be included in the general order and go over until Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, that resolution will be included in the general order. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GORMAN. Meantime, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not wish to have any misunderstanding about this matter. Since 2 o'clock the Senate has been discussing the first resolution on the Calendar of General Orders. Is that resolution included in the unanimous-consent agreement as to the others?

Mr. GORMAN. Oh, no, Mr. President. I trust the resolution I offered December 19, if there is no objection to it, may now be considered and passed. It provides merely for a reprint of this document and asks the Post-Office Department to send it in officially. I think that there is no objection to that, and therefore I ask that that resolution may be voted on. I trust it will be adopted now.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Which resolution is that? Let us know what it is.

Mr. ALDRICH. Has there been any suggestion that that resolution should be taken from the Calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] made a motion that all the resolutions touching the Post-Office Department be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. That motion was made before 2 o'clock, and it will be the pending motion, the Chair supposes, on Friday morning instead of to-morrow morning, because by unanimous consent the resolution of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] comes up to-morrow immediately after the morning business. Now, what the Chair wishes to know is whether the resolution upon which the discussion has taken place is to be included or is included in the unanimous-consent agreement; otherwise it stands at this moment as the unfinished business.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let it go over as the unfinished business.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the resolution, if the Chair will kindly have it read, is the one proposing merely a reprint of the document which has been laid before the other House. The resolution simply asks the Postmaster-General to forward it officially to the Senate and have it printed. I understand there is not the slightest objection to it.

Mr. SPOONER. Let it be read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution first on the Calendar of General Orders will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PENROSE December 1, 1903, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, in view of the charges of corruption, extravagance, and violations of law in the administration of the affairs of the Post-Office Department, is hereby authorized and instructed to request the Postmaster-General to send to the committee all papers connected with the recent investigation of his Department and if necessary to make further inquiry into the administration of the said Department, and to make report thereon to Congress upon completion of said investigation.

Said committee shall have power to send for persons, books, and papers, examine witnesses under oath, employ a stenographer, and sit by subcommittee or otherwise during the sessions of the Senate or during the periods of its adjournment at such times and places as the committee may determine, and the actual and necessary expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SPOONER. If that is the resolution, it must go over.

Mr. GORMAN. That resolution, of course, goes over under the general understanding, with the remainder of the resolutions. I want to secure the adoption of the resolution providing for a reprint, the resolution stated a while ago. That is the one I offered. Any resolution relating to an investigation, as a matter of course, comes under the understanding and goes over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary read the resolution which is the first on the General Calendar.

Mr. SPOONER. That is included in the understanding. It goes over.

Mr. GORMAN. That is included, as a matter of course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is it the understanding of the Senate that the resolution which has just been read is included in the unanimous-consent agreement as to all other resolutions touching the Post-Office Department?

Mr. ALDRICH and Mr. GORMAN. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and will so understand it. The Secretary will state the next business on the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 887) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the southern Appalachian Mountains, to be known as the National Appalachian Forest Reserve.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 7, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 6, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read, corrected, and approved.

FOREST RESERVES.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees. The Clerk proceeded with the call of committees.

The Committee on the Public Lands was called.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8460) providing for the transfer of forest reserves from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the gentleman from Iowa consent to let that bill go over. There are certain Members of the House who desire to look into it, and possibly to oppose it; or there might be some agreement made about the bill. I should very much like to have the chairman of the committee consent that the bill go over.

Mr. LACEY. It is a unanimous report, Mr. Speaker, but the bill has its place upon the House Calendar and can lose nothing by delay. If the gentleman desires time to look into it, I shall not insist on taking it up at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I did not gather the force of the gentleman's remarks. I did not hear him.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands does not insist on having the bill considered at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. All right.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman a question. I understand this is substantially the same bill that was before the House some time last year.

Mr. LACEY. This bill covers one feature of the bill which was before the House last year. That bill contained several features, and this is limited to only one proposition.

Mr. BURKETT. Last year the Departments were in conflict about it, were they not?

Mr. LACEY. Not at all.

Mr. BURKETT. As I understand it, this bill is indorsed both by the Department of Agriculture and the Land Department of the Department of the Interior. Is that correct?

Mr. LACEY. Yes; that is correct. Last year, however, there was opposition, led by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] upon the floor of this House and also very strongly supplemented by the gentleman who now occupies the chair. The bill last year was a combination bill containing a number of propositions. This bill, however, has only the single proposition as to the transfer.

Mr. BURKETT. It makes the transfer in accordance with the request of both Departments?

Mr. LACEY. Yes.

Mr. BURKETT. In accordance with the request of the man who does not want charge of the matter, and also in accordance with the request of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. LACEY. Yes. In accordance with the request of the gentleman from Indiana, I shall not press the bill at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. May I ask the gentleman whether this bill in any way, directly or indirectly, involves the question

of the assembling of the public lands or the destruction of the checkerboard system in the West?

Mr. LACEY. Not at all. The only proposition—and I would like to say this to the House at this time in order that no gentleman may have any misunderstanding as to the importance of the bill—the only thing involved in it is as to the administration and control and management of the forest reserves as they are now established, or as they may be hereafter established, as to whether they shall be managed by officers under the Secretary of the Interior or whether their control and supervision shall be under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. That is the only proposition involved, and this bill proposes to transfer their administration to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And this bill in no way involves a proposition for the assembling of the public lands?

Mr. LACEY. No. There is a bill pending that perhaps may come up further on.

Mr. BURKETT. What I wish to ask the gentleman is this: Does the bill transfer the division having in charge forest reservations to the Agricultural Department? And if the transfer is made, does it take the clerical force and whatever equipment there is, almost entirely? Does it do that?

Mr. LACEY. No; all matters of title will remain with the Department—

Mr. BURKETT. I am speaking of the working force.

Mr. LACEY. All the working force would go to the other Department.

Mr. BURKETT. As I am informed, all but about four or five or six clerks are transferred over.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and it is this: Does the bill take away from the President the power to make these reservations?

Mr. LACEY. Not at all. There is no question involved in it except one of administration.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does it give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to make temporary forest reserves?

Mr. LACEY. That can only be done by the President.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand the Secretary of the Interior has been holding up these reservations temporarily, and thus keeping them from settlement for a number of years, which has given great trouble in the West, as I apprehend. I hope the Secretary of Agriculture will not do so, if this matter is transferred to him.

Mr. LACEY. That is not involved at all.

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER ON THE ISLAND OF OAHU.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when the Committee on the Territories was called). I call up for consideration the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk, from the Committee on the Territories.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7266) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the manufacture, distribution, and supply of electric light and power on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to call attention to the fact that this bill is on the Union Calendar, and not on the House Calendar.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would suggest to the gentleman that it was first placed on the Union Calendar by error, and subsequently corrected in the usual form, and it will be found on the House Calendar, not being a subject for the Union Calendar.

Mr. PAYNE. That may be very true; but if it is upon the Union Calendar it can not be considered under this order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The calendar clerk will confirm my statement that it is upon the House Calendar, although the printed Calendar may not show it.

The SPEAKER. The House Calendar shows the bill upon it.

Mr. PAYNE. I find it on the House Calendar of this morning. It was not shown to be on the House Calendar that I had in my hand. The Calendar this morning does not show that it is on the House Calendar, to which it belongs.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that by error this bill appeared on the Union Calendar, but it now appears on the House Calendar.

Mr. PAYNE. I find that it is on the House Calendar.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I desire to have order during the reading of this bill.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I also desire to ask for order, because I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Connecticut that the bill is now being reported.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. There will be ample opportunity when the bill is reported.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I want to ask it at this stage of the proceedings.

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent it can be done.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would like to ask the gentleman if there was not a tacit understanding that the bill should not come up until the member of the committee from Connecticut was present?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I had no authority from the Committee on the Territories to make such an agreement, and no such agreement was made. Yesterday was the first time that I had any information that there was any objection to the consideration of the bill by the gentleman from Connecticut, member of the Committee, that would extend to opposition to the bill on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7266) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize and provide for the manufacture, distribution, and supply of electric light and power on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.

Whereas the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii did, by an act duly passed at the 1903 session thereof, grant to the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited) a special franchise and special privileges for the purpose of maintaining and operating an electric light and power system on the island and Territory aforesaid; and

Whereas the governor of said Territory did approve said act on the 28th day of April, 1903; and

Whereas the act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, duly passed by the Congress of the United States on the 27th day of April, 1900, and approved on the 30th day of April, 1900, provides that the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii shall not grant to any corporation, association, or individual any special privilege or franchise without the approval of the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress of the United States of America does hereby ratify, approve, and confirm that certain act, duly enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii at the 1903 session thereof, known and designated as act No. 48 of the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, session of 1903, the said act last mentioned being an act entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric light and power on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii," and that the said act last mentioned, and each and every part thereof, be, and the same is hereby, ratified, approved, and confirmed, which said last-mentioned act is as follows:

"ACT NUMBERED FORTY-EIGHT.

"An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric light and power on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.

"Whereas, pursuant to a franchise granted by the government of the Hawaiian Islands, the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited) has constructed and developed an electric light and power system on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas said company is at the present time supplying light and power to the inhabitants of the said island of Oahu; and

"Whereas said franchise expires on the 3d day of May, 1906: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"DEFINITIONS.

"SECTION 1. The following words and phrases, wherever they are used or appear in this act, shall, unless the same be clearly inconsistent with the context, be construed to mean and be held to have the force and effect as follows:

"(a) The 'company' shall mean, include, and represent the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited) and its successors and assigns.

"(b) 'Honolulu,' or 'district of Honolulu,' shall refer to, include, and mean all that portion of the island of Oahu included in the taxation, educational, and judicial district now defined by law as the 'Honolulu district' or the 'district of Honolulu.'

"SEC. 2. That the right is hereby granted to the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited), as a body corporate under that or such other name as the said company may hereafter adopt, and its successors and assigns, for the term of thirty-five years from and after the passage of this act, to manufacture, sell, furnish, and supply electric light, electric current, or electric power in the district of Honolulu, and elsewhere on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, for lighting the streets, roads, public or private buildings, or for motive power, or for any other purpose which it or they may deem advisable, and from time to time for said thirty-five years, for the purposes above mentioned, to construct, maintain, and operate suitable poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lamp-posts, conductors, conduits, and such other appliances and appurtenances as may from time to time be necessary for the transmission, distribution, or supply of electricity to consumers thereof, under, along, upon, and over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said district of Honolulu, and elsewhere on said island of Oahu, and to connect the said lines, wires, and conductors with any manufactory, private or public buildings, lamp, lamp-posts, or other structure or object with the place of supply.

"BUILDINGS AND STATIONS.

"SEC. 3. Said company shall also have the right to maintain and operate its present light and power station on the corner of Halekauwila and Alakea streets, in said Honolulu, and also to construct, maintain, and operate, at such points as may from time to time be necessary, light and power stations or houses, or such other buildings and structures as may be necessary and proper, and to use machinery therein for the purposes of the company.

"METERS, RATES, AND CHARGES.

"SEC. 4. Said company shall also have the right to maintain, operate, and use electric meters or other means of measuring electric light, power, or current supplied from time to time, and to locate the same at such places as may be deemed necessary for their protection; and said company shall also have the right to charge, receive, and collect from all consumers of electricity such prices as may from time to time be fixed and determined by the company, but such charge shall not at any time exceed 20 cents per kilowatt hour or 1,000 watt hours. The company shall have the right to charge, receive, and collect from each consumer of electricity for lighting the minimum sum of \$2 per month, and from each consumer of electricity for power the minimum sum of \$1 per month per horsepower of apparatus connected to the service of the company.

"CONNECTIONS.

"SEC. 5. Said company shall also have the right to charge consumers, or applicants for the use of electricity, for one-half of the cost and expense of making connections between the company's main lines and the premises where the electricity is to be used; such cost and expense to include the price of all wires, poles, insulators, and other materials, and labor necessary to be used in making such connections: *Provided, however*, That the company shall not be required to make, construct, or maintain said connections as aforesaid for supplying light or power unless the applicant or applicants for such light or power, if required, shall deposit in advance with the company a sum of money sufficient to pay one-half of the cost and expense of making and constructing such connections and for current for the period of one month.

"SEC. 6. The company shall not be required to extend, construct, or maintain its main lines beyond a distance of 300 feet unless there be an applicant for each 300 feet of extension or fraction thereof, and unless each applicant shall, in addition to the other requirements in this act provided, agree to take, install, and maintain five 16-candlepower lights or one horsepower of power apparatus for not less than one year: *Provided, however*, That if the company is unable to furnish power or light applied for by reason of lack of capacity of the apparatus for producing electricity, the company shall be allowed a reasonable time, not to exceed nine months from the date of any application, to procure such additional apparatus as may be necessary to furnish such applicant.

"SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY.

"SEC. 7. The company shall have the right to discontinue or cut off the supply of electricity to any consumer who shall refuse or fail to pay the amount due for electricity supplied by said company within such reasonable time as said company may fix for the payment of the same, and such discontinuance of service or supply of electricity shall not prejudice the right of the company to any remedies now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for the recovery and collection of said amount.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS.

"SEC. 8. The superintendent of public works is hereby authorized to make, and from time to time to change, amend, or add to, reasonable rules regulating the placing of poles and wires, the insulation of wires and apparatus carrying the electric current, and the maintenance in good repair of all poles, wires, and apparatus, and generally concerning the manufacture and supply of electricity, which may be necessary or proper for the public safety and welfare.

"No person, firm, or corporation shall be allowed to place or maintain poles or wires along, upon, or across any public street, except such as are authorized by law so to do. Any person violating this provision last above mentioned shall, upon conviction, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$50 or by imprisonment not exceeding three months. The superintendent of public works may at any time cause such poles or wires to be removed at the expense of the person, firm, or corporation placing them or causing them to be placed in such position.

"If at any time the company, after reasonable notice given to it in writing, shall fail to observe or execute the rules and regulations hereinbefore provided for, relative to the placing of poles and wires, the insulation of wires and apparatus carrying electric current, and the repair of all poles and apparatus, the superintendent of public works may, in his discretion, after giving the company reasonable notice thereof in writing of his intention so to do, proceed to remedy such failure, and the cost of such repairs or changes may be recovered from the company by the Territory.

"SUPERVISION.

"SEC. 9. The entire plant, operation, books, and accounts of the company shall from time to time be subject to the inspection of the superintendent of public works or other officer appointed by him for that purpose.

"PAYMENTS TO THE GOVERNMENT.

"SEC. 10. The said company shall, within one month after the expiration of each year, file with the superintendent of public works a statement showing the gross receipts from the sale of electric light and power furnished by the company, and shall at the same time pay to the superintendent of public works 2½ per cent of the gross receipts of the company from all electric light or power furnished to consumers during the preceding year.

"PURCHASE OR LEASE.

"SEC. 11. The said company shall have the right to acquire, hold, or take over, either by purchase or lease, property, both real, personal, or mixed, and such other property as may be necessary or incidental to the proper conduct of its business; said company shall, however, not have the right to purchase franchises and property of whatever nature of another company of like nature.

"BORROWING OF MONEY AND ISSUANCE OF BONDS.

"SEC. 12. The said company, whenever from time to time it shall be deemed expedient in the furtherance of the objects of the company, shall have the power to borrow money and to secure the payment thereof, with the interest agreed upon, by mortgage of all or any portion of the property, which may include the franchise of the company and the franchises and privileges granted or obtained by virtue of this act, or if it be deemed advisable, bonds may be issued, secured by a deed of trust of such property as aforesaid, together with all future acquired property, as well as the income and receipts of the property from whatever source derived, and in such form and under such terms as said company may deem advisable: *Provided*, That nothing in this section contained shall operate to prevent said company from obtaining the usual business credits and to make promissory notes without security.

"PENALTIES.

"SEC. 13. Whenever said company refuses or fails to do or perform or comply with any act, matter, or thing requisite or required to be done under the terms of this act, and shall continue so to refuse or fail to do or perform or comply therewith after reasonable notice given by the superintendent of public works to comply therewith, the said superintendent of public works shall, with the consent of the governor and the attorney-general, cause proceedings to be instituted before the proper tribunal to have the franchise granted by this act and all rights and privileges granted thereunder forfeited and declared null and void.

"SEC. 14. Any person who shall willfully or intentionally injure, molest, or destroy any of the poles, lines, wires, meters, or other appliances, or the material or property belonging thereto, or shall without permission or authority of the company connect or cause to be connected by poles and wires, or by any device, with the wires, cables, or conductors of the company, for the purpose of obtaining electric current for light, heat, or power, or whoever shall, without such permission or authority, cut or cause to be cut wires or other devices connected with any meter or meters erected or set up for the purpose of registering or recording the amount of electric current supplied

to any consumer by the company, or change or shunt the wiring leading to or from any such meter, or by any device, appliance, or means whatsoever, tamper with any such meter in such manner that such meter or meters will not measure or record the amount of electric current supplied to any consumer by the company, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof in the district court of Honolulu, or other court having jurisdiction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$100 or by imprisonment with hard labor not exceeding six months: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to affect the right of the company to recover by action at law damages for any injury done by such unlawful action.

"GRANT NOT EXCLUSIVE.

"SEC. 15. It is hereby expressly provided that nothing herein contained shall be construed as to grant to the company the exclusive right to furnish, sell, or supply electric light or power.

"SEC. 16. This act shall take effect and become law from and after the date of its approval.

"Approved this 28th day of April, A. D. 1903.

"SANFORD B. DOLE,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the committee labors under some disadvantage this morning by reason of the absence of the Delegate from the Territory, who introduced this bill. However, I am assured that he has no objection to its consideration, and the committee will do its best to present the matter fully to the House in his absence. I desire first, in my time, to have the report read, and I will ask order during the reading of the report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report of the committee in the time of the gentleman from Indiana.

The report (by Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana) was read, as follows:

By the organic law entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," passed in 1900, it is provided:

"SEC. 55. That the legislative power of the Territory shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States locally applicable."

A restriction is placed on this general right of the legislature, in the same section, in the following language: "but the legislature shall not grant to any corporation, association, or individual any special or exclusive privilege, immunity, or franchise without the approval of Congress."

Under that grant of power the Hawaiian legislature passed this act, which was approved by the governor of the Territory April 28, 1903, and which act is part of the bill H. R. 7390, on which this report is based. The subject-matter of the bill so passed and which received the governor's signature is found in the title of the same, which reads as follows: "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric light and power on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii."

The island of Oahu has an area of 598 square miles and a population of 58,504, of which the only village or city is Honolulu, with a census population of 39,309, and which by a fair estimate has probably increased to 42,000.

Governor Dole, in his report to the Secretary of the Interior of 1903, referred to the subject herein in the following language:

"Act 48 of the Session Laws of 1903 confers a new franchise, not exclusive, on the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited), whose former franchise, which was an exclusive one, expired May 3, 1903. The act grants the right to the company for thirty-five years to manufacture and sell electric current for light, power, and other uses in the island of Oahu; to erect and maintain such poles and wires and other appliances that may be necessary to the said business along, over, and under public highways; to erect and maintain lamps and lamp-posts thereon, and to maintain its present power house in Honolulu, and to erect and operate other power houses and stations as may be necessary; to charge not more than 20 cents per kilowatt hour or 1,000 watt hours, except a minimum charge of \$2 a month to consumers of electricity for lighting, and to borrow money and mortgage its property therefor. Two and a half per cent of its gross receipts to be paid to the government of the Territory."

This is a fair statement of the import and purposes of the act. Under the language of the restrictive clause of the organic act, to wit, "exclusive privilege, immunity, or franchise," resort to Congressional legislation in approval of the act would not be necessary, but under the word "special" the act requires the "approval" of Congress. The act passed by the Hawaiian legislature is not a grant of an exclusive privilege, immunity, or franchise.

The Hawaiian legislature convened February 18, 1903. The bill was introduced in the house there February 25, and the measure finally passed the legislature April 25 and was signed by Governor Sanford B. Dole April 28, 1903. In the act as first introduced this provision was contained: "This act shall take effect and become law from and after the day of its approval, subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States," but the words "subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States" were stricken out.

In a letter to the Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON, Speaker, and Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE, President pro tempore United States Senate, in form the same, Hon. Sanford B. Dole, now judge of the United States district court of the Territory of Hawaii, and Hon. George R. Carter, now governor of Hawaii, recommended the approval of this act.

The letters are as follows:

"HONOLULU, HAWAII,

"November 26, 1903.

"Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

"HONORED SIR: I have the honor to state that during my incumbency as governor of the Territory of Hawaii the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited), at that time operating under its former grant from the government of the Hawaiian Islands, well and faithfully performed all of its obligations to the government and adopted a policy of constantly improving its plant and increasing the efficiency of its services to the consumers of electric light and power in Honolulu.

"I heartily recommend the favorable consideration and approval by the Congress of the United States of the act passed at the 1903 session of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii granting to the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited) certain rights and privileges for the distribution and supply of electricity throughout Honolulu and elsewhere in the island of Oahu. The urgent needs of the community require that the electric light and power system as now developed be continued in its operation.

"I have the honor to be, respectfully,

"SANFORD B. DOLE."

"EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, November 20, 1903.

"Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

"HONORED SIR: Relative to the matter of the act to provide for the manufacture and supply of electric light and power by the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited) in Honolulu and elsewhere in the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, I have the honor to state that the above-named company has to my knowledge so conducted its affairs and exercised the rights and privileges heretofore granted to it by the government of the Hawaiian Islands as to give to the inhabitants of Honolulu an efficient and adequate electric light and power system; that it has faithfully observed and performed its obligations to the government, and that at the present time it is furnishing the public a well-managed and complete electric light and power system.

"I have no hesitation in recommending the approval by the Congress of the United States of the act enacted by the last legislature of the Territory of Hawaii granting to the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited) the right to maintain and operate an electric light and power system in the island of Oahu with its appurtenant rights, as I deem that the granting of such rights and privileges will be subservient to the public welfare.

"I have the honor to be, respectfully,

"G. R. CARTER,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

This bill was introduced by the Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii, who was heard before your committee in its behalf, as was A. Lewis, jr., from Honolulu, in behalf of the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited), and F. M. Hatch, a lawyer of that city and a former minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Hawaii, and William Haywood, a representative of commercial bodies of the islands. The committee gave full consideration to the arguments heard and the facts presented, and felt impelled to favorably report this bill.

It is a safe and wise policy to give as large a measure of home rule to Hawaii as is consistent with the provisions of the organic law, which gives full power to the legislature on this subject, except in the manner before stated.

It would be a very rare case that Congress would be justified in withholding its approval to an act of the Territorial legislature on a matter of purely local concern, and especially when upon its face no objection appears and when, after the lapse of months after its passage, no objections have been presented. The committee is fortified in this conclusion by the indorsements of the constituted authorities in the islands.

It was clearly the intention of Congress in the organic law to grant a large measure of power to the local legislature in matters of local concern, and the approval of this act will be within the spirit and intention of the organic law.

The act does not prevent or exclude any other corporation, association, or individual from acquiring like rights and pursuing the same course as is now being adopted by the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited), and of applying for and the legislature granting rights and privileges similar to those obtained by said company by virtue of the aforesaid act. The act grants no exclusive franchise, this fact being particularly so expressed in the act.

The Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited), a corporation, was incorporated October 13, 1900, with a capital stock of \$20,000. On May 3, 1893, they were granted an exclusive franchise to supply electricity in the city of Honolulu for a period of ten years, upon a payment to the Government of a royalty of 2½ per cent of the gross receipts. This required an increase in the plant, and the stock was therefore increased June 24, 1893, to \$150,000, and on March 24, 1895, to \$250,000. The demand for electricity rapidly outgrew the plant, and the stock was further increased on April 6, 1900, to \$350,000. On December 5, 1900, it was increased to \$425,000, and July 25, 1901, to \$500,000, all paid up except \$7,500 paid to People's Ice Company for property purchased.

The capitalization at the present time is \$500,000, and the stock is divided among 105 stockholders, the majority of whom are island people. This gives an average holding of 47 shares each. The largest single holding is 560 shares, and the remaining number are divided as follows:

Stockholders holding between—		
400 and 500 shares	1
200 and 300 shares	4
100 and 200 shares	9
50 and 100 shares	10
1 and 50 shares	80

There are but 4 stockholders residing outside of the islands with a combined holding of 313 shares: 1 shareholder on the island of Maui with 42; 6 on the island of Hawaii with 60; 12 on the island of Kauai with 593 shares, and 82 in Honolulu holding 4,000 shares. It will be seen from the above figures that this company is distinctly a Hawaiian company and that the holdings are widely distributed throughout the islands. The increase in the capitalization shows the remarkable growth of the company, and, from the statements of the company, the value of the plant on January 1, 1903, was \$539,928.19. On January 1, 1900, the plant account stood at \$276,743.92, and the difference of \$263,184.27 shows the increase in the plant account within the period of three years.

From a statement returned to the superintendent of public works on June 1, 1902, the gross receipts from June 1, 1901, to June 1, 1902, were \$131,581.16; the royalty paid to the Territorial government through the superintendent of public works was \$3,280.59. Other taxes paid by the company for the year amounted to \$6,594.38, or a total of \$9,885.97, being a very substantial realization to the government. The company pays a royalty of 2½ per cent on the gross receipts to the government.

The company was incorporated in the year 1891 and began business in 1892. The capitalization has been heretofore given, and the dividends that have been paid to the present date, covering a period of eleven years, are as follows:

	Dividend.	Per cent.		Dividend.	Per cent.
1892.....	0	0	1898.....	\$19,750	7.9
1893.....	0	0	1899.....	26,250	10.5
1894.....	0	0	1900.....	14,000	4.0
1895.....	0	0	1901.....	17,500	3.5
1896.....	0	0	1902.....	32,500	6.5
1897.....	\$6,750	2.7			

From this table it will be seen that for several years the company paid no dividend, and even during the past year the dividend has been very small. The average dividend which each stockholder has received during the entire period of the operation of the company has been but 3.2 per cent. At the present time the company is paying a dividend of one-half of 1 per cent

per month, and the prospects for the ensuing year are that no greater dividend will be paid.

On November 1, 1903, the company furnished lights to 1,689 consumers, with a total connected load of 29,671 16-candlepower lamps. At the same time it was supplying power service to 62 motors of a total capacity of 479½ horsepower, to different industries in Honolulu, as elevators, electric fans, to dentists, and to a conveyor of goods on the wharf.

The pay roll on November 1, 1903, showed 80 men in the employ of the company at the average monthly wage of \$71.52 per man. Three engineers received \$180, \$125, and \$110, respectively, while firemen were paid \$75 per month. Coal, one of the chief items of expense secured from Oregon, Washington, Nanaimo, and New South Wales, varies from \$6.82 to \$9.82 per ton. Salaries of manager, electricians, accountants, etc., are in proportion.

The rates under the act for lighting are 20 cents per kilowatt hour for the first 3,000 watts per 16-candlepower lamp installed per month; all excess 10 cents per kilowatt hour, \$2 a minimum charge. For power, 1 to 100 kilowatt hours per month, 16 cents; then on a sliding scale to 8 cents at 1,700 kilowatts per month, 5 per cent discount for cash in ten days. The company extends an optional rate to consumers of \$1 per month per 16-candlepower lamp burning until midnight, and \$2 per month per 16-candlepower lamp burning all night.

The company is a substantial, well-organized company, which has supplied in the past and is now supplying to its patrons a reliable, up-to-date service, at a price reasonable in consideration of the high cost of material and labor which prevail, and it is the only commercial lighting company supplying electric light and power to the general public in Honolulu. The Territorial government operates an electric light and power system for the purpose of lighting the Territorial buildings and all public streets, except seventy are lights in the outlying districts which, by contract with the Territorial government, are furnished by the company to the government. The government of the Territory does no commercial lighting. The presence of the government system in the community would prevent any arbitrary or unfair treatment by the above-named company if, through a change of management or otherwise, such a policy should be attempted.

It is necessary that the investment of the company be rendered secure by the approval of its franchise by the Congress of the United States.

The report of the committee of the house of representatives of the Territory of Hawaii, where the bill was first introduced, is attached to this report as an appendix.

The committee believes that it will be to the interest of the people of Hawaii and in consonance with the organic law and a safe and wise policy in the direction of local self-government in Hawaii to approve this legislation by the legislature of the Territory, and recommends the passage of this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman wait until I make a brief explanation of a few sentences and then supplement what has already been read at the Clerk's desk by two other letters?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, from what has been read from the desk we have the information that the Territorial legislature of Hawaii in April last passed a measure that was before it from February 25 till it was approved by the governor April 28, 1903, and it is presented in hæc verbæ to this House for approval.

In addition to that, ex-Governor Dole, who is now on the bench of the United States district court of Hawaii, recently appointed, sends a letter to the Speaker of this House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, recommending to Congress the approval of this act of the Hawaiian legislature. In addition to that, Governor Carter, recently appointed as such, in a like letter to these officers asks Congress to approve this act.

I now desire to present a letter addressed to the Speaker of this House from the superintendent of public works of Honolulu, who is appointed by the governor.

The Clerk read as follows:

HONOLULU, HAWAII, November 26, 1903.

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: The legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, at its session held 1903, enacted an act granting certain rights and privileges to the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited), enabling it to properly distribute and supply the inhabitants of Honolulu with electric light and power.

I have been informed that this act will be submitted to the Congress of the United States for approval, and in that behalf I would state that during my incumbency as secretary of the Territory, and also as superintendent of public works, I have been brought in contact with the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited) in its relations with the government under its former grant of power from the government, and am pleased to state that the above-named company readily and faithfully observed and performed all of its obligations to the government, and exerted its best efforts to provide the citizens of Honolulu with an efficient and adequate service. And I furthermore state that it would be for the best interests of the community at large that favorable action by the Congress of the United States be taken approving of act 48 of the session laws of 1903 of the Territory of Hawaii, the same being an act granting rights and privileges to the Hawaiian Electric Company (Limited) to manufacture, produce, and supply electric light and power for Honolulu and elsewhere on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, inasmuch as this company is the only company now in Honolulu supplying electric light and power.

Respectfully, yours,

HENRY E. COOPER.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, not being an expert electrician I sought the services of the chief electrician of the Capitol building, who runs a plant here for us almost equal in capacity and in the supply of current to the one in Honolulu.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I might say that this contains electrical information, and it might be better to have the letter read first.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, the letter is to be read now. I thought it had been read.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And immediately after the reading I will gladly yield.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES U. S.,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1903.

C. P. GLIEM, Esq., Electrician, Capitol.

DEAR SIR: Referring to our meeting in your workshop in Capitol, on Saturday, 19th ultimo, and our conversation, let me say that I desire information on the subject-matter of Report No. 18 on H. R. 7266. I placed in your hands on that day the report. Some of my inquiries, which I will put in form, will cover points in the field of electricity, which, with your technical knowledge, you will be able to answer; others will be directed to the cost of furnishing or manufacturing electric current, and I apprehend you will take the statement of others. When this latter occurs, will you kindly state the source of your information?

Being an officer of the Government yourself, I desire the best information I can get, and desire it, so far as may be, to bear your official indorsement, as I desire it to be used on the floor of the House in explanation of the bill, if required.

The points on which information is desired follow.

I shall be pleased if you return to me with your answer this letter and the questions propounded.

Yours,

J. M. ROBINSON.

1. What percentage in the operating expenses of a plant furnishing electricity for power and light, capacity 30,000 16-candlepower lamps, and also 62 motors of total capacity of 479 horsepower—what percentage would be represented by the item of expense for coal?

Cost of anthracite coal, at \$5.79 per ton, delivered at Capitol, would be 14 per cent of selling price of current at 10 cents per 1,000 watts, or kilowatt. Cost of bituminous coal, at \$4.25 per ton, delivered at power house in Washington, would be 10 per cent of selling price of current at 10 cents per 1,000 watts, or kilowatt. A thousand watts would supply current for 17½ lamps of 3½ watts per candlepower, standard lamp in general use.

2. What is the kind of coal used in Washington, D. C.?

Anthracite coal at Capitol; Cumberland or bituminous wherever permitted.

3. What is the price for coal delivered at power station?

Four dollars and twenty-five cents per ton for bituminous delivered at power house; \$5.79 per ton for anthracite delivered at Capitol.

4. What is heating property or standard by per cent or table of coal thus used in Washington, D. C.?

For bituminous coal, an average of 14,000 heat units per pound; for anthracite coal, an average of 15,000 heat units per pound.

5. The same as to Washington (State) or Oregon coal?

Washington coal, Carbon Hill, 12,316 heat units per pound; Oregon lignite, 11,000 heat units per pound.

6. The same as to Nanaimo, British Columbia, coal?

Unable to find data in regard to Nanaimo.

7. The same as to New Zealand, New South Wales, coal?

Coal varies from 12,546 to 15,752 heat units per pound.

8. What are prices of electric light in Washington, D. C. (price list will do)?

Ten cents per kilowatt hour for one hundred and twenty hours per month; all excess, 5 cents per kilowatt hour.

9. What are prices of electric power in Washington, D. C. (price list will do)?

Ten cents per kilowatt hour for thirty hours per month; all excess, 5 cents per kilowatt hour.

The present rates under the new franchise granted by said act 48, for lighting, are 20 cents per kilowatt hour for the first 3,000 watts per 16-candlepower lamp installed, per month; all excess, 10 cents per kilowatt hour; \$2 a minimum charge. For power, 1 to 100 kilowatt hours per month, 16 cents, then on a sliding scale to 8 cents at 1,700 kilowatts per month, 5 per cent discount for cash in ten days. The company extends an optional rate to consumers of \$1 per month per 16-candlepower lamp burning until midnight, and \$2 per month per 16-candlepower lamp burning all night.

10. How do the rates above mentioned compare with the Washington, D. C., rates for like current? Give proportionate per cent, if convenient.

Double. Twenty cents per kilowatt would give 17½ lamps 16 candlepower for one hour under the above schedule; after three hours the same number of lamps for 10 cents an hour. Minimum charge or meter rent, \$1 per month.

11. What in measurement is a kilowatt?

One thousand watts. Seven hundred and forty-six watts equals one electrical horsepower, and about 550 one indicated horsepower or coal-pile horsepower.

C. P. GLIEM,
Chief Electrical Engineer, United States Capitol.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am now ready to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this original charter for this company was given by the monarchy in 1893 for a period of ten years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The company organized in 1890. It is stated erroneously in the report as 1900. It should read 1890, but they got a franchise under the Republic in operation in 1893.

Mr. PAYNE. For a period of ten years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is correct.

Mr. PAYNE. And this bill proposes to make it a period of thirty-five years?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. What influenced the committee to make it thirty-five years instead of ten years? And in that connection I find here, in the report of the committee to the Hawaiian legislature, on page 8, this statement:

Your committee finds that there is a strong feeling in this city against granting franchises for a longer period than ten years. As a large corporation of a quasi-public nature, such as this is, should not be subject to the whims of nearly every succeeding legislature, your committee suggested in its partial report that the term be limited to fifteen years.

What suggested the longer time?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Has the gentleman concluded his question?

Mr. PAYNE. Why did the Committee on Territories recommend this period of thirty-five years for this franchise, which seems to be an exclusive franchise practically?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The portion of the report which the gentleman read as having been included on the final presentation of the bill before the house of representatives of Hawaii, he will find, if he will read the entire report, the context both before and after the portion that he read entirely disagrees in all of its general features with this particular portion he read. Will the gentleman give the names of those who signed that report?

Mr. PAYNE. I am afraid I can not pronounce them.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Well, we will pass that, but if I were to guess—

Mr. PAYNE. One is chairman of the committee on agriculture and manufactures. The rest are on the committee. There is one dissenting. He says, "I do not concur." But I am not good on pronouncing Hawaiian names.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If I were to guess, with some knowledge of the Hawaiian government, I would guess that as a compromise to placate one member perhaps they inserted the portion that the gentleman has read in the report, which is entirely discordant with the other two or three pages of the report, whatever it is. That is the only explanation I can make of that. But the legislature passed the bill as it is presented here, and the governor approved its action and asks us to do so.

Mr. PAYNE. There is nothing in that report, is there, that contradicts the statement made that the citizens of Honolulu are opposed to anything beyond a ten-year franchise?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. They recommend, in the report from which the gentleman has read an extract, that the bill "do pass," and in all other parts speak of its approval by the legislature. All the way through the report, except the extract the gentleman refers to, is in contradiction to that particular portion.

Mr. PAYNE. It says that the citizens of Honolulu were opposed to the granting of anything more than a ten-year franchise.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The statement was made, but it is contradicted and is disputed in all the context preceding and following.

Mr. PAYNE. Why, the gentleman does not mean to say there is anything in the report that contradicts the fact that the citizens of Honolulu are opposed to anything beyond the granting of a ten years' charter?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Oh, yes; the report of three pages favors the granting of this particular franchise for this length of time.

Mr. PAYNE. It states here that there is a strong feeling against granting franchises for longer than ten years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I rather think, if I guess correctly, that was put in to placate some member of the committee, and he signed the report recommending the passage of the bill, and it was passed.

Mr. PAYNE. And not because it was the right thing to do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It is not in harmony, Mr. Speaker, with the remainder of the report, and it is not in harmony with the conditions that are presented to the committee and the House now. What are those conditions? Sanford B. Dole, the governor of the Territory then, who has held official positions almost during his whole lifetime and who was president of the Republic, who has been governor by appointment of the President, and is now his appointee as a United States district judge, asks us to approve this legislation.

Mr. PAYNE. The governor approved it and somebody else approved it, but there is no evidence that the governor knew the feeling of the people of Honolulu in regard to this matter.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But I will give the gentleman circumstantial evidence, as I was proceeding to do. The late governor, a lifelong resident of Honolulu, now on the bench, says that this is a good thing and ought to be approved by Congress. The legislature said so in their final determination. The present governor of the Territory says so. The superintendent of public works says so. The Hawaiian Delegate says so. And to this day the committee has received no protest, after diligent inquiry, using all means at hand—the act was passed in April last—no protest, no word of dissent from the island; and there are only 2,000 white voters on that island, and they are the users of this current, and there must be alert business men among them.

Mr. PAYNE. That may all be, but possibly the citizens do not know that we desire to know their wishes on this question. The Delegate of the Hawaiian Islands is here introducing this bill, asking to have the Congress of the United States approve this act. It may be that the citizens of Honolulu do not know that it is necessary to have the act approved.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I am sorry that the gentleman from Hawaii is not here to defend his bill, but we must do the best we can in his absence, and we will try to give the gentlemen of the House all the light we can.

The bill was introduced in the Hawaiian legislature about the 25th of February, 1903. In the bill first introduced was the provision "subject to the approval of the Congress of the United

States," thus serving notice on those interested over them—the business people who use the electric light, and only these largely use it, together with the Chinese and Japanese merchants, who are usually alert—serving notice on them in the original bill as introduced that the bill must be approved by Congress. The governor, in his report to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, on page 82, refers fully to the Hawaiian bill, giving length of time and prices. He asks Congress to approve, as does the superintendent of public works and all the constituted officers and authorities from whom the House has heard. For the last eight months the people there must have known, through these proceedings and the press—the business men must have known—that the measure would be presented to Congress for approval.

Letters have come to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House from the official constituted authorities, and no word of dissent has the committee, by industry and activity, been able to find to the measure. Of course it is not easy to gain information on subjects affecting insular possessions 5,000 miles from the seat of government as this is. It is not easy to legislate for them, and it will be still more difficult if we can not trust the word and recommendations of the officers appointed by the President to give us this, and can not take their word as a bond of faith that the legislature elected by the people has voiced their wishes and safeguarded their interests.

Our difficulties will be multiplied by the facts that our different insular possessions have different conditions, different environments, and have had, and have had different systems of government.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I have presented evidence on the subject and that we should give a great measure of self-government. I may say to the gentleman from New York that the ex-attorney-general, E. P. Dole, of Honolulu, on New Year's Day was in my office for three hours discussing this whole proposition of Hawaiian legislation; and I will supplement the statement of these other officers and the investigation of the committee with his statement that while he was not familiar with the subject-matter here he knew of no objection being made to the measure. Mr. Hatch, of Honolulu, ex-minister of foreign affairs, holding that office when Hawaii was a republic, though not making an argument on this subject, being interested in another, on being asked, stated to the committee that there was absolutely no objection to it.

This is a measure of home rule, and I desire to present it as such.

Mr. PAYNE. In regard to the question of conflict of opinion on this subject, I desire to ask the gentleman whether the entire press of the city of Honolulu did not, during the discussion of the bill, oppose granting so long a term?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I do not believe, from reliable information I have, that the press could unite there on anything, there is such a fierce opposition. There are only two or three papers in Honolulu.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee rose.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope the gentleman will wait a moment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield first to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like to ask a question.

Mr. PAYNE. I have not yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee, much as I should like to do so. I am trying to ask a question myself. I understand that the price of this light is limited to 20 cents per kilowatt hour, and that the report of the electrician of the Capitol says that the price charged here in Washington is just half of that—10 cents; and my information is that throughout the United States the usual price is limited to 10 cents, while in this bill it is fixed at 20 cents.

Why did not the committee guard the interests of the citizens of Honolulu more carefully and reduce the price to 10 cents—a reasonable price, especially in view of the duration of the proposed franchise?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman heard the reading of the letter from the chief electrician, wherein he gave the strength of the coal used in Honolulu and the coal used in Washington.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, but I understood—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And there is a measurement in that of the coal strength for generating current, and a comparison of the strength of coal used there and here, and the prices, respectively, which form a basis for comparison of the cost of manufacture of the current in Honolulu and elsewhere. Likewise he paid attention to the rate of wages in Honolulu, which will be seen to be largely in excess of the wages paid in general industries on this continent. White men, well skilled, needed in an electric plant will not go to Hawaii without great inducements.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; I tried to listen to that, but I got the idea that the coal cost of the electric current was a very small percentage of the total cost of producing the current.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes, 12 to 16 per cent, as I re-

member the figures, based on a large plant that furnishes Washington, with a population of 300,000.

Mr. PAYNE. Fourteen per cent?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Fourteen per cent of the cost of production, or thereabout.

Mr. PAYNE. So that the difference in the quality of the coal and the difference in the price do not seem to cut a very large figure, even if it was doubled. Fourteen per cent would not amount to very much, and would not furnish any excuse for doubling the price of the electric current.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. We'll, I suggest to the gentleman that we gave them home rule over there, and this seems to have the perfect approval of the people, who seem to know what they want.

Mr. PAYNE. Congress specially provided for home rule, and allowed them to do certain things; but where a special franchise was to be granted, Congress tied a string to it, and said they must come here to have it approved before the act would be effective there, although passed by their legislature.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Well—

Mr. PAYNE. Now, so long as we have done that, it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to approve or disapprove of the bill which they have passed. That being so, I do not see how the home-rule argument would enable us to shirk our duty toward the people of Honolulu.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Oh, we certainly should not shirk our duty.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] permit me to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] a question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will yield to both gentlemen.

Mr. HAMILTON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], in his questions to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], seems to be possessed of some information in relation to what the people of Honolulu think, which information is so exclusive that it seems almost homemade.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I read from the report—

Mr. HAMILTON. I should like to have the gentleman state at this time where he obtained this exclusive information.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. HAMILTON. I think the gentleman from New York was about to reply.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I was going to make a suggestion—

Mr. PAYNE. In the report I marked the paragraph containing the information.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. If the gentleman from New York possesses any special information with reference to the franchise, he possesses something that the Members generally do not seem to have.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I will furnish this to the House. Wait a minute and I will furnish the chairman of this committee with the report of the committee, and will point out to him the paragraphs on page 8 from which I read to the House, and that was the information which I gave. It came from the gentleman's own committee.

Mr. HAMILTON. Now, if it pleases the gentleman from New York, I will proceed to read to the gentleman from New York those parts which he may have overlooked.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman having challenged the correctness of my citation—

Mr. HAMILTON. The gentleman from New York yielded to me.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman ought to proceed in his own time and let me further catechise the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. I am talking in my own time now. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] yielded to me.

Mr. PAYNE. All right.

Mr. HAMILTON. This statement proceeds as follows:

From the comments of the local press regarding the term of years for which franchise was asked, namely, fifty years, there seems to be a strong opposition to granting franchises except for a very short period. It was suggested that no franchises should be granted for a term exceeding thirty years—

This is the idea which they seem to have of a short term—

and the privilege of such a franchise is now enjoyed by the Rapid Transit Company. True, the original franchise of the company was for a period of ten years.

Now, reading further on page 7, from which the gentleman from New York read—

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; I read from page 8.

Mr. HAMILTON. Well, from the same report. It is well that the House should fully understand.

Their franchise was granted for a period of thirty years, but at the end of the fifteenth year we find them practically out of business and supplanted by an up-to-date plant. From a supplement of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, in which the terms of franchises of electric light and traction

companies are set forth, it is found that of 71 franchises upon which information is available the term of such franchises are as follows: 31 one are for a term of nine hundred and ninety-nine years, 8 are for a term of ninety-nine years, 14 are for a term of fifty years, 3 are for a term of forty years, 9 are for a term of thirty years, 4 are for a term of twenty-five years, 2 are for a term of twenty years.

This is the report from which the gentleman was reading.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. This was an original franchise.

Mr. HAMILTON. That is so. I am reading the report to the gentleman from New York from which he stated to the House that it was a general understanding of the people of Honolulu that the franchise was too long.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I know; but what the gentleman has just read relates to an original franchise.

Mr. HAMILTON. It relates to a franchise.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. And it relates to its extension?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes, it relates to its extension.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. For thirty-five years?

Mr. HAMILTON. For thirty-five years. The old franchise was an exclusive franchise. This franchise is not an exclusive franchise. Permit me to proceed.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. In other words, the original franchise was granted for ten years by the monarchy, and this committee asks the Republic to give them an extension of thirty-five years.

Mr. HAMILTON. I do not know whether that was given under a monarchy or not, but it was a valid franchise. And this committee is reporting the bill which passed the Hawaiian legislature unanimously as to its senate, with only two dissenting votes as to its house, and was approved without qualification by two governors of Hawaii.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. It was a very valuable franchise.

Mr. HAMILTON. I do not know as to that. I leave that to the gentleman from Indiana to determine.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. It was 6 per cent.

Mr. HAMILTON. For a part of the time it did not pay any dividends. It appears now, reading further from the report from which the gentleman from New York was reading:

As a large corporation of a quasi-public nature such as this is should not be subject to the whims of nearly every succeeding legislature, your committee suggested in its partial report that the term be limited to fifteen years, but suggests that even that is very short.

And this statement the gentleman from New York read as sustaining his position:

Even that is very short, and so begs leave to submit herewith a statement taken from the supplement to the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of June 29, 1901.

From what the gentleman from New York said, one would get the impression that the people of Honolulu thought that this franchise was altogether too long.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman take the time now to read a line and a half from this report, just preceding the paragraph which he has just read, and it will give the House the information.

Mr. HAMILTON. I was reading from the report that the gentleman from New York was reading from.

Mr. PAYNE. Shall I read it or will you read it?

Mr. HAMILTON. Certainly you can read it, only state to the House where you find it.

Mr. PAYNE. It is on page 8, just preceding the paragraph which the gentleman last read. Perhaps he can locate it. It is a line and a half.

Your committee finds that there is a strong feeling in this city against granting franchises for a longer period than ten years.

Now, that appears to be the feeling of the citizens of Honolulu, and there is not a word in this report now before us that contradicts that statement.

Mr. HAMILTON. It seems to me that this statement should be read in connection with the whole report, wherein it is said:

From the comments of the local press regarding the term of years for which franchise was asked for, namely, fifty years, there seems to be strong opposition to granting franchises except for a very short period.

Then they proceed to say what they regard as a short period, as follows:

It was suggested that no franchise should be granted for a term exceeding thirty years.

Now, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the further statement of the Territorial Committee. This committee proceeds to say that they find that this franchise should be, for the reasons set forth, a thirty-five-year franchise.

Now, as to this franchise, it appears to me that the length of the franchise is a difficult question and one which we ought to consider carefully; but the Territorial legislature of Hawaii, all of them presumably intelligent people, had this matter under consideration, and they unanimously voted in favor of this franchise in the Territorial senate and unanimously, except two votes, voted for it in the house. This bill then was approved by Governor Dole, and afterwards by Governor Carter, who succeeded Gov-

ernor Dole, and both governors write letters in which they advocate the ratification of the law. That is the way in which this law comes to the House of Representatives and comes to the Committee on the Territories. Under the organic law of the Territory of Hawaii this act of the Territorial legislature must be approved by Congress. Now, the question is whether this Congress shall approve it. The difficulty seems to be as to the length of the franchise. That is the trouble.

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAMILTON. I do not claim to have any exclusive information in relation to this.

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose it would be entirely competent for Congress to give a franchise, a new franchise or an extension of franchise, by law of Congress?

Mr. HAMILTON. I assume that is true.

Mr. PAYNE. So that there is no difficulty about that. Now, as to the dividends that have been paid by this company, I find, commencing with the years 1879, they paid 2.7 per cent; in 1898, 7.9 per cent; in 1899, 10.5 per cent; in 1900, 4 per cent; in 1901, 3.5 per cent, and 1902, 6.5 per cent on a capital which has been increased from \$200,000 to \$500,000.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And \$150,000 of that increase has come from the earnings of the company.

Mr. PAYNE. I am very glad to get that statement. That is what I was going to ask the gentleman. It is stated here in this report, however, that all this capital stock was paid in except \$7,500, which was used for the purchase of land—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Seven thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, if \$150,000 is capitalized as the earnings of the company, is the gentleman able to state through what years these earnings and profits are distributed, and how big a thing these people are getting upon the capital stock which they have invested there; and how much these dividends might have been if they had all been distributed to the stockholders instead of \$150,000 being put in the construction of plant and distributed in stock; is the gentleman able to state that?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I refer the gentleman to page 4 of the report, wherein the dividends in figures and by years are stated fully in a tabulated form.

Mr. PAYNE. I read from that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then, in addition to that, there is \$150,000 surplus in the company represented by their property, which would run back through the entire time. I will say to the gentleman it would make between 6 and 8 per cent that has been earned through the entire period on the capital stock, as I gather it from the statement.

Mr. PAYNE. The \$150,000 is the total amount of dividends they have paid—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But the dividends they paid only amount to—as the gentleman will see by the report—3½ per cent, I think the statement is.

Mr. PAYNE. From the original construction of the plant in 1892—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Three and two-tenths, the gentleman from Ohio suggests, the average since 1893.

Mr. PAYNE. From the original construction of the plant, when the plant was worth \$20,000 and the capital stock \$20,000—I do not know whether this report shows the date at which the additional issue of the stock was made by years—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It does.

Mr. PAYNE. And it has been through a long series of years growing from one amount to another, and finally it got to \$500,000. Now, with \$150,000 surplus profits lying in the treasury of that company has grown all these dividends they have ever paid, and the dividends have yielded 3½ per cent, and we all know in the inception of these companies the earnings are small and the profits are small. It is only when a plant is fully established and when the business is fully established that a thing shows its profits, and its profits come in the later years. It seems to me that this committee should have furnished to the House just what there is of it—just the necessity of charging these people there 20 cents a kilowatt hour, and instead of ten years—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The committee did furnish that. Let me suggest that this company pays 2½ per cent of its gross receipts to the Hawaiian government.

Mr. PAYNE. Now they will extend this for thirty-five years with this business increasing, with these profits increasing, and with the economies constantly being introduced into electric-light plants and the production of electric currents. Those things should all have been considered. Why, I am told by gentlemen here upon the floor that 5 cents is a large estimate of a kilowatt hour for the cost of electric current.

I have been told by one gentleman that he happened to hear a discussion between a couple of superintendents of electric-light plants, and they were trying to convince each other that the current costs a little over 1 cent per kilowatt hour, and they did not either of them succeed in convincing the other that it costs even 1 cent.

I think this committee ought to have given this information to the House. They ought to see to it, because the power is reserved in us—wisely reserved in the House, and reserved for the special purpose—and this House should see to it that no company should get any grant from the people in the Hawaiian Islands by way of franchises by which they would be enabled to get an undue profit from their customers in furnishing electric light, especially when it is to be a franchise for thirty-five years, so that it should be impossible, or next to impossible, for any other company to get in there and cut down the cost by competition.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, sir; I think I am talking in your time.

Mr. HAMILTON. I was very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSVENOR rose.

Mr. HAMILTON. If the gentleman from Ohio will permit me, the gentleman from New York yielded to me for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman from Michigan is entitled to the floor.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am not opposed to that, but I want to get the floor when he is through.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I had yielded to the gentleman from Michigan such time as he desired.

Mr. HAMILTON. I want to inquire of the gentleman from New York whether in his opinion it is not possible that this bill may be amended as to the length of the franchise?

Mr. PAYNE. I think this bill, to be candid and frank with the gentleman, ought to be recommitted to the Committee on Territories, with authority to bring in a substitute after examining into these questions. I think that would be just to the committee. I can realize how, in the hurry of the holidays and the desire of the people to have this bill introduced, it may have been put in without due examination. It might come from any committee in that way. I think it ought to go back to the committee and be fully considered and let them do the amending and bring in a substitute, and then if there is a desire to amend it—

Mr. HAMILTON. There is the further fact that had some influence with the subcommittee that had the bill under consideration, and that was that the whole of the Territorial legislature of Hawaii, the house and the senate, Governor Dole, Governor Carter, and various committees that had it under consideration might possibly be presumed to know something about what they wanted in relation to a franchise relating to the city of Honolulu and the island of Oahu, and might possibly be supposed to know as much about it as some Members of this House, more than 5,000 miles from there. However, this question of the length of the term of the franchise is a question which ought to be considered very carefully by the Members of this House, and there are differences of opinion in relation to it.

So far as I am concerned, as a member of the committee, I would be perfectly willing to have some amendment offered in relation to it. I hope that it may not be found necessary to send the bill back to the committee, and if there can be some understanding as to the length of the franchise which would be satisfactory, perhaps the bill, which is otherwise carefully drawn, may meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me suggest. The gentleman says that there is some difficulty about this act of the Hawaiian legislature, and that it may be necessary for Congress to pass an act of its own independently—

Mr. HAMILTON. There is that question.

Mr. PAYNE. That ought to be considered by the committee, and this matter of price ought to be considered by the committee. I was in hopes that the gentleman would himself move to recommit the bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that I have not the charge of the bill on the floor.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is the only franchise which this company has, or is the company organized under the general law of Hawaii with the additional power given to it under this bill?

Mr. HAMILTON. It is not.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Then the bill is wrong from start to finish. There is not a word in it as to the amount of the capital stock, and the rights of the stockholders are not preserved in any way. They can issue stock for any purpose, either for its own line of business or any other.

It can bond itself and its franchises to any extent; it can change its name at will; it can practically do as it pleases—just as any

general partnership could do—without any restriction whatever. I have asked my question in good faith. As I understand it, there is not a State in the Union that would grant a franchise of this kind.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It is a special franchise; that is the reason of a resort to Congress.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly it is a special franchise; but no special franchise should be granted anywhere that does not specify a limit of possible capitalization—a limit of the possible bonding privilege. But this bill proposes to give the company the right to do almost anything on earth it sees fit to do. No such franchise should be granted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will ask to have read a statement on this subject—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. Is there any gentleman from the Committee on the Territories desiring to be recognized in opposition to the bill?

Mr. LILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to register my opposition to the bill. I do not know that I could say anything in opposition to it in addition to what has already been said.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire recognition?

Mr. LILLEY. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for one hour.

Mr. LILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to the provision allowing a charge of 20 cents per kilowatt per hour, and also to the length of the term during which the franchise is to continue. I do not care to make any further remarks, and will yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LILLEY. As much time as the gentleman from Ohio wants.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that this bill should have come to the House of Representatives with the sanction of the distinguished antimonopoly and anticorporation Member from the State of Indiana. If ever there was a proposition offered to an intelligent legislative body that undertook to give away a valuable franchise without the slightest protection to the people, this is that proposition.

In addition to what the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has said in regard to the lax description of the corporation and the enormous, the unlimited power proposed to be given to it, I call the attention of the House to the fact that nowhere in this measure is there any power reserved to Congress or to the Territorial legislature to repeal or modify or in any way attack or change this franchise for thirty-five years to come.

So far as the solemn act of Congress can do it, this bill confers an immutable franchise as to the existence of the corporation, its right to be a corporation, its unlimited power to issue stock, and its unlimited power to transfer itself somewhere else, and then I wish, further, to point out that there is no provision by which anybody can by any possibility help themselves afterwards.

I call particular attention to section 13, which is one of the most ingeniously drawn sections of the whole bill, drawn evidently for the purpose of deceiving somebody. I do not charge that the action of this committee has been unwarranted in this matter. They have brought in the bill as submitted to them, but whoever drew this thirteenth section understood pretty well what they were doing.

After having conferred upon this corporation all these powers they undertake to deceive, in my judgment, the people of the island with the notion that if this corporation transcends its powers or fails to do its duty under the provisions of its charter there is remedy provided in section 13. I read the language of that section:

Whenever said company refuses or fails to do or perform or comply with any act, matter, or thing requisite or required to be done under the terms of this act, and shall continue so to refuse or fail to do or perform or comply therewith after reasonable notice given by the superintendent of public works to comply therewith, the said superintendent of public works shall, with the consent of the governor and the attorney-general, cause proceedings to be instituted before the proper tribunal to have the franchise granted by this act and all rights and privileges granted thereunder forfeited and declared null and void.

Yet there is no suggestion in the measure that any failure to perform any or all of these acts shall work a forfeiture of the charter. That, I say, is an ingeniously drawn provision.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. After Congress has approved this act, could the Territorial legislature withdraw this charter during the term of thirty-five years?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not know what the powers of the Territorial legislature may be; I do not know what are the terms of the organic act.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. There is no provision here by which the legislature could do that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Surely not. Now, what is it that works the forfeiture of a charter? In all acts of this kind—take, for instance, charters we have granted here from year to year for the

past twenty years within my personal knowledge—they have always provided that the failure to comply with the conditions named in the charter shall be held to be a forfeiture.

Non constat. Now, it might be held that all this was simply a mere piece of verbiage, with no force or effect behind it. Now, this is an act to grant a great monopoly. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] appreciates that fact, because I find on page 5 of the report of the hearing before the committee that he himself put this question:

Would it not be safer to assume that it is practically an exclusive right that you have there and that your fair dealing is the point now at issue? It amounts practically to a monopoly, you know. These franchises necessarily do in all cities.

And yet my friend, with all his antimonomopolistic bitterness and wisdom, is creating that identical monopoly and forcing it upon the people of Hawaii for thirty-five years, an irreparable and irredeemable proposition that they can not get rid of for all that time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In so far as the establishment of a \$500,000 plant in a 42,000 population city forms a monopoly, it is a monopoly, except that the government has a plant there that lights the government buildings and lights the public streets, except seventy arc lights that they buy current for from this company.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, well, the gentleman will find that the trouble is that we are attempting to go back to old things that have passed away in the estimation of wise legislators for many years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have a list—

Mr. GROSVENOR. One moment, if you please. The Territorial legislature of the island has the power to provide by a general law for the incorporation of these companies.

Now, that is my first proposition. They have that power under such restrictions as they may see fit to provide. Surely one of the restrictions ought to be on the amount of capital stock, and the form in which it shall be issued, and the terms upon which it may be forfeited, and the limitations that may be affected by subsequent legislation, and all that, and then the people there can organize another and competing corporation.

That is the true principle of corporations to-day. There is no modern constitution, of all the forty-five States of the Union, that has not long ago got rid of this special-franchise provision. It always leads to trouble, and it is a monopoly that the genius of these times inveighs against. Let there be passed by this Territorial legislature a general provision for incorporation. Let it come here, approve it if we see fit, and in the long run we shall have gotten rid of this whole subject so forcibly embodied in this measure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman favor reciprocity with his colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], as he, with my consent, took much of my time, and yield to me just a little time?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will give the gentleman all the time he wants.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The only point was to show a list of cities that have granted franchises for street railways and for electric-lighting companies, a number of them in Ohio perpetual, and in all the States ninety-nine, fifty, forty years—something I am not in favor of—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. For original franchises.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And for thirty and twenty-five and twenty years, covering cities throughout the country. I am referring solely now to statistics on the length of franchises.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman is not quite correct; but, allowing that to be true, in every one of those franchises power is given to the legislature to control the rates of fare or the rates that may be charged by the lighting companies, and everything of that sort, and absolutely to repeal the charter if they see fit to do it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman then overlooks—

Mr. GROSVENOR. One moment. Let me explain further. If that provision was in this franchise, I should not feel about it as I do now. These franchises are wisely issued for a long term of years. We have franchises in Ohio that have no limit at all. We are now limiting them.

I believe the longest street railway franchise in Ohio is now twenty-five years, but in every case, without exception, the legislature reserves the right to change all these terms that affect the people, and to limit the issue of bonds and stocks and everything of that sort, bringing them completely under the regulation of the system of government which we have. If you had that here, there would be some propriety in this measure.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Now, Mr. Speaker, the matter is productive of one thing. We are governing an insular possession, Hawaii, 2,500 miles from our nearest point, inhabited by a census population of 154,000 people, now grown to 175,000 people,

of whom 110,000 are Chinese and Japanese cooly laborers, 40,000 native Hawaiians, and less than one-tenth by the census are whites, and to get that total white population you have to take the Portuguese, the Koreans, the Spanish, Austrians, and the Italians into your calculation. Very few of the people, of those who are white, are natives of our own country.

The total vote there at the last election for Delegate was 13,000. Of those 13,000 votes less than 2,000 were cast by white voters in the island of Oahu, on which the capitol is situate. They are the ones who are using the electric light; they are the ones who have passed upon the question of the necessity for this legislation; they are the ones from whom till now no dissent has come to Congress, though eight months have intervened since the Hawaiian legislature passed the bill; and questions such as these will always surround you unless you give to them the quality of home rule. It is true that representatives of particular interests come to our committees and to Congress to urge measures which they seek to guide us in with their light as paid attorneys; but, sir, ex-Governor Dole is not of such. Governor Carter is not, and we all hope that the appointees of the President and the men appointed by them, who urge us to approve this legislation, are not. If they were, we well could say, Away with insular government!

If it is the purpose of the House and of Congress not to give these people home rule when their legislature, the second elected under the law, has favored it, and when those who are constituted the judges of the needs and interests of the people and to provide for the wants of the people of the islands have stated that they are in favor of it, where the legislation for ten months has been before the people and no word of dissent or disapprobation has appeared, if it is the purpose of this House, in their legislation for insular possessions, to destroy that quality of home rule, I stand with it in the future. The Committee on the Territories favorably reporting this bill is your servant, and will bow to your mandates.

I was opposed to Hawaii being annexed as an insular possession. I am opposed to their system of landed estates, amounting to tens of thousands and a hundred thousand acres under a single corporation and worked exclusively by cooly labor. So many cooly laborers are there that I believe the knell of white labor has already been rung in the Hawaiian Islands. I am opposed to the immigration system there that permits the cooly labor to drive out the American and white man. The organic law we passed for them, if its spirit is enforced, I think a wise measure. On the island of Oahu there are 59,000 people, of which 42,000 are in Honolulu, but those not belonging to the Chinese and Japanese races and native Hawaiian are few; but they are shrewd men, and they have officers appointed for them by the President of their own race. If the House wishes to deny them that quality of home rule it is in their power to do so.

I do not know more than about six people who live there and have only met them casually, and as we see them before the committee they seem to be good people and amply able to protect their rights, and certainly able to let us know if the legislature that they elected has been recreant or the appointed governor has abandoned them. There are not many of the ruling class; not many voters. The orientals are away on the plantations and the other islands. The legislature met in their city. For two months this bill was before it, and for eight months the people affected have been silent. No word of protest has reached us.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope the gentleman will not take all of my time in discussing the race question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Now, if it is the purpose of this House to say that these people can not have home rule under the organic law, why, everybody is content; the Hawaiian Territory must be content; but we are confronted by a condition. Men who have not government as our people enjoy it seem, however, to be qualified to protest if it is wise to do so. Are we going to establish our system on this evidence and decline to give them the permission to do what they think is best for themselves? What I would know is whether we are going to give faith to them and their established authorities and their establishments, or shall we take the initiative and press legislation on them from this central point, with all the difficulties and perplexities that confront us when we assume that their conditions are the same as ours and when we consider the wide space between us?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now I will proceed with my speech.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for the time he has yielded me.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If there is anything in the statement of the gentleman from Indiana, it is this: Because the people of Hawaii or a majority of them are Chinese, and other colored or disabled or disqualified people, therefore we ought to grant the monopoly to the white people down there to "skin" these people out of whatever they may have during the balance of their natural lives and do it under the hypocritical cry of "home rule."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The Chinese and Japanese are laborers who work on the corporation plantations outside of the only city, Honolulu, on Oahu Island, and on the other six islands of the Hawaiian group.

Mr. GROSVENOR. There has been no stronger argument made for my proposition than that which the gentleman has himself made. I am seeking to give home rule. I want a provision made under a general corporation act, and this legislative body has the power to grant it. The legislative body has the power to make it and send it here for our approval.

Mr. RODEY. This corporation is one which was probably organized under the general corporation act of the Territory, and that act no doubt provides proper limitations on the electric company; that is evidenced by the act of the Hawaiian legislature, as it designates it as an existing corporation, "limited," presumably of the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Coming over from the King.

Mr. RODEY. And under the corporation organized under that act it no doubt has the limitations desired by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, this charter came from the King originally, and you have undertaken to perpetuate the powers of that special charter by this special legislation.

Mr. RODEY. I desire to say that there is no Territory but what has a general incorporation law, giving persons the right to create corporations. This power comes to the Territories from the organic act of each.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What does this charter say?

Mr. RODEY. It is that way in our Territory. The corporation would go before a city or county board and ask for a charter and put before those bodies the information necessary to consider in granting the charter. The city of Honolulu perhaps, not being incorporated, asked for this charter for the corporation. That electric-light company is now in esse and is a corporation limited by the general laws of Hawaii.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, what are the general laws?

Mr. RODEY. I am not informed as to that. I did not take much part in the hearings on this bill before the House Committee on Territories.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Exactly. The gentleman is not informed as to what the general laws are. I stand here and say that there is no limit upon the issue of bonds. I ask the gentleman what the limit of the organic law was, and he is not able to state. I say that this is a power given to it that would practically enable it to control the entire future legislation.

Mr. RODEY. It is not so in our Territory, our general incorporation contains all proper limitations.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I was not talking about the corporation act of New Mexico. I was talking about this. It is entirely apparent that here is one of these corporations, and I was about to proceed when the gentleman interrupted me to say that our policy has been to get rid of just such things as that.

We passed an act prohibiting the issue of everything of this kind in the Philippine Islands; we passed an act prohibiting everything of this kind in Cuba while we had military possession of it; we passed an act preventing everything of the kind in Porto Rico. It worked hardship for the time being, but in the end it worked out a great benefit to the people there. We gave them an opportunity to rid themselves of special franchises issued by Congress.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman give us what amendment he would suggest? Will the gentleman give what particular objection he has, so that we may perfect the bill?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The serious objection I have to the bill starts in the first section and ends with the last line of the last section.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then he would not grant any franchise.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would not—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What particular objection—

Mr. GROSVENOR. If I had my way—the gentleman asks my judgment about it—I should not ratify this special charter at all. I would suggest for the people of Hawaii to pass a general act authorizing the corporation and send it here for our approval, and we will amend it and fix it up so it will have limitations and safeguards that we are throwing around the corporations in the other States. I would not turn over any great industry of this character to an unlimited and uncontrolled Hawaiian corporation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield to me for a motion to recommit—

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will not now. The gentleman is running the whole machine, apparently; now let me run it a little while.

Mr. THAYER. I would like to ask the gentleman for information—I did not have the pleasure of being with the committee when this matter was considered—from the debate here it seems

to me that it is proper that this should be recommitted, and what I want to ask the gentleman, with his experience, is this: I notice here in the organic act it says:

The legislature shall not grant to any corporation, association, or individual any special or exclusive privilege, immunity, or franchise without the approval of Congress.

Now, suppose we could prepare a bill that we think would be acceptable to the House, would you advise that we attempt that or simply refuse to vote this and tell them to go back and themselves produce an act which we could approve?

Mr. GROSVENOR. As the gentleman has frankly asked the question, inasmuch as there seems to be a necessity for early action upon the question, I think I should pass an act such as I would be willing to ratify and approve.

Mr. THAYER. We seem to have no power—we have power to approve whatever they do, but can we do that?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Certainly we can. Congress has power to legislate for any and all our Territories. We can also repeal in whole or in part any law these Territorial legislatures enact. We can approve or nullify. No trouble about this. It is simply a question of policy, not power.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from Michigan asked me to yield him time to make a motion—that I yield five minutes. I yield back the time.

Mr. LILLEY. I just want to make this point: The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] remarked that Hawaii had very few friends in this House. I certainly think that her friends here would be very few if they allowed this bill to go. Certainly we should not be friends to the people who buy electricity at 20 cents per kilowatt hour for thirty-five years if we did so.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LILLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. Are you a member of the Committee on the Territories?

Mr. LILLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLESON. Did you make any adverse report on this bill?

Mr. LILLEY. No, I did not.

Mr. BURLESON. Why did you not do it?

Mr. LILLEY. I did not know that the bill was coming up.

Mr. BURLESON. Why did you not know it was coming up?

Mr. LILLEY. I should have been back Monday, but was delayed a couple of days in court on my way, and I had not the slightest idea that this bill was coming up.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is fair to the gentleman to state that that statement was made on yesterday.

Mr. LILLEY. If I had had any idea whatever that this bill was to be introduced or discussed to-day I should have been here earlier. I just arrived in Washington, and I knew nothing of it till I came on the floor and it was under discussion.

I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I had prepared an amendment which I intended to offer at the proper time, but as this bill will unquestionably be recommitted I want to make this suggestion. This House has been sitting as a board of supervisors, or a board of county commissioners, for the District of Columbia for a good many years, and we have had to meet just such questions as these from session to session, and we have invariably inserted this clause in all these special franchises and charters: "That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act."

I had prepared an amendment applying it to the proposed law, providing that "this act shall be subject to amendment or repeal by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, or the Congress," so that either of them could amend or repeal it. This ought to be added, whether we adopt the ten-year franchise or not. There ought never to be a franchise of this kind granted without reserving the power to alter and repeal, and if the bill goes back to the committee I would suggest to the gentleman the adoption of this amendment, which we always insert in District of Columbia bills under like circumstances—that it ought to be included in this act for the protection of the people of Honolulu.

Mr. HAMILTON. I think that would be an excellent idea.

Mr. LILLEY. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I should be very sorry to see this bill go back to Hawaii without an approval of some kind. I do not think we ought to do it. This company is operating now without any franchise. If the statements of the committee are to be relied on, it is now practically a joint partnership. I do not think so. In looking this over I think this is about the way the thing has come up: Ten years ago the King gave to certain gentlemen the privilege of operating an electric-light plant, 2½ per cent of the earnings to be paid to the Government. In 1900, as near as I can get at it, a small joint stock company was organized under the general law. That is the way I

understand it, a small joint stock company of \$20,000. Noticing in the bill that no reference was made to anything of that kind, I asked a question about its franchise. There is nothing in here providing for capital stock. There is nothing in here providing for an annual meeting of the stockholders. There is nothing in here protecting the rights of the stockholders in any way, and I think, if the committee will dig deeper, it will find that there is a joint stock company, and then this additional power is given them by the Territorial legislature.

Now, I think it would be a mistake to send this back and say that you may operate under a general law. Why? Because I do not think it would be right that the Territory should make a general law by which anybody could organize a joint stock company and take possession of the streets and highways in Honolulu. They tried that in the State of Connecticut, and we refused absolutely to throw open the public highways to the possession of any three people who might get together and organize a joint stock company and take possession of them. We say they are public property and if you want to use them for street railways you must go to the legislature and show the necessity for such action.

I think the people of Honolulu are acting rightly in regard to this matter. I hope that this committee will bring in a special act; but, Mr. Speaker, it should not allow an unlimited capitalization; it should not allow the corporation to change its name or unite at will with any other company, as it would have the right to do under the provision on page 3 of this bill. It should not have the right to take possession of private property for the purpose of stringing whatever wires it might choose to put up. I know it is a disputed question whether the bill now gives that power or not; but I call attention to page 4, where I understand the company is authorized to take possession of streets and highways and—

To connect the said lines, wires, and conductors with any manufactory, private or public buildings, lamp, lamp-post, or other structure or object, with the place of supply.

I am very glad to hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] speak as he does with reference to this bill. He recognizes the difficulties of this case. And I want to pay a tribute to the subcommittee that had this bill under consideration. There has been a good deal of somewhat irrelevant discussion here, but I believe the subcommittee has been doing very faithful work on this bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. We are a long distance from Honolulu, and the people over there seem to have gone over this matter with great care before their legislature and before the governor. It is a difficult thing for us to go over the question in detail here. As the gentleman has suggested, we may run adversely to some local conditions. The committee, I am sure, would be glad to receive any suggestions from the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think it is a reasonable supposition that the language of section 2, on page 4 of the bill, would give this company the right to string its wires over private houses, etc. Possibly they would have to pay for such privilege, for of course they could not take private property without compensation.

Mr. HAMILTON. I do not think any company can come along and hitch its wires to my tree or my house without my consent.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Why, then, put this provision in the bill?

Mr. HAMILTON. I think it is surplusage.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Then strike it out.

Mr. HAMILTON. There is this difficulty which, as I am informed, the committee has to contend with: Here is a bill passed as a whole by the Hawaiian legislature and approved by the governor of Hawaii—

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. If the gentlemen will secure me an extension of time, I am willing to yield further, but I have only ten minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Very well; I will not occupy the gentleman's time further.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I wish to call attention to another provision, on page 5, which, I think, should receive the careful consideration of the committee. I refer to the provision which gives this company the right to charge a person \$1 a month anyhow, whether he uses the electricity or not, provided he has the wire connected with his premises.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is a minimum charge. I understand a similar rule exists everywhere.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. There may be such a rule in operation in Washington, but this is a specific franchise, giving this company a specific privilege. Let me read the language:

The company shall have the right to charge, receive, and collect from each consumer of electricity for lighting the minimum sum of \$2 per month, and from each consumer of electricity for power the minimum sum of \$1 per month per horsepower of apparatus connected to the service of the company.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is to pay for putting in the connection and running the current.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. But this, I think, is a very serious proposition—that there should be a charge of \$3 per month whether the person uses the electricity or not, or if the consumer's bill amounts to only \$1 a month, the company may double it. That is one of the things to which I think the attention of the committee should be called.

Then there is another thing. I have no objection to the exclusive character of the proposition. I believe in that where public property is to be taken and where the streets and highways are to be used for a purpose of this kind. I do not think it should be within the power of anybody who may choose to organize a stock company and take possession of private property for the purposes of that company. To that extent I am a believer in monopoly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. This, however, is not an exclusive privilege.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. But I do not believe that section 12 should be allowed to pass in the form in which it now is, allowing the company to bond its property and its franchise to an unlimited extent, without any proportion whatever between its indebtedness and its capitalization. I think the committee should very carefully guard that provision.

Mr. HAMILTON. What does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I should certainly suggest that the bonding power be limited; that at least the capital of the company should be paid in and the company not allowed to bond for more than an equal amount.

Mr. HAMILTON. I mean, what does the gentleman suggest as to whether the bill ought to go back?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think it ought to go back to the committee, that some of its provisions may be corrected before it is again brought in. When a proper bill is submitted to us we should approve it. I think the people of Hawaii are entitled to that.

Mr. HAMILTON. I think that is true; but the question is whether the bill should go back to our committee or whether it should go back to Hawaii.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Oh, I do not think that is necessary. This company is now doing business, and the only question is as to whether these enlarged powers proposed in this bill should be granted.

Mr. HAMILTON. But the committee may have to frame a bill ab initio.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think not. I understand the gentleman is willing to make a motion that the bill be recommitted. Let the bill go back to the committee; let them reconstruct it on modern lines, without reference to any privileges given by a king ten years ago. Let this corporation be reconstructed on the line of republican corporations—of course I do not mean "republican" in a political sense, but let the committee bring the bill back here in a properly revised and reasonable form.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LILLEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that this bill should either be recommitted or that Congress should at once, as private property and the public needs are involved, enact a general incorporation law which will cover this particular case and mercantile and manufacturing corporations generally. There are very few limitations in this bill that reach down to and protect the people as they should be protected.

The original charter, it seems, was one granted by the old royal Government, and, as we inherited this and other monarchical laws when we annexed that Territory, they are still the laws of Hawaii, except where they have been repealed or are prohibited by the Constitution of the United States. Congress may, as we have the power in law, ratify or nullify what the local government does in and for Hawaii. This is old law. I agree with my friend from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] that we should allow and maintain home rule there as well as here, and wherever our flag floats, as far as that is concerned; but even in our own local, home-ruled governments we often enact vicious laws. We are all finite, at best.

It seems the Hawaiian legislature has sent us this measure that does not meet with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. PAYNE]. It does not meet with the approval of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], and there seems to be considerable contention about it among the members of the Committee on Territories, while there are reasonable, wise, and natural objections from some of the Hawaiian people.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] says, in effect, that the reason why the ten-year limit was changed to thirty-five years was because of one hard-headed juror—one man out of twelve, so to speak—one member of the committee objected. He ruled the other eleven jurors. Is that man present in the House? He surely is a Member. I ask these questions for information.

If not, where is he? Why is he not here? Where is that dissenting man? Where is that gifted and powerful man? Why is he not here to tell us the story of his life or the story of the Hawaiian people who are about to be plunged into utter darkness if we defeat this bill?

Where is this man, I ask? What are his reasons, I repeat? The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], whose heart is always right, if not his head, can not tell us why it is that he agrees to the thirty-five-year limit as against ten years—at least, he has not done so. If he has, I have not heard him. I want him or any Member to answer my questions. I have not heard this matter explained. Some have heard a good deal of reading from a report, but nobody has been able to discover yet that dissenting Member of the committee or his reasons for this change. If he is on the floor, or can be found, or if he may be brought into this Chamber and invited to give his reasons, I should be very glad even now to hear them.

I am willing to yield to him the balance of my time, and if I have not time enough I hope some one will yield it to him, so that we can hear from that one man who has controlled the whole committee and is now about to control this House, and let him tell us why the change is made by the committee from ten years, a limit, it seems to me, in this day and time that is wise, and surely more so than the unwise and monopolistic proposition of thirty-five years. [Applause.]

Mr. LILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I move that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. HAMILTON. I suggest to the gentleman whether the motion ought not to be amended so as to instruct the committee to report a substitute?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me, I think it better to let it go to the committee without any limitation upon its discretion.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That gives us full power over the subject.

Mr. HAMILTON. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] moves to recommit this bill to the Committee on the Territories. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the next committee.

The Clerk resumed and completed the call of committees.

LOUISIANA PURCHASE CELEBRATION AT NEW ORLEANS.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, I some time ago reported to the House a resolution accepting an invitation extended to the House to attend the celebration held in the city of New Orleans commemorating the transfer of sovereignty over the Louisiana territory to the United States. The resolution could not be called up on account of the objection of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The time has now elapsed, and I move that the resolution lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. CAPRON, for one week, on account of sickness.

To Mr. BEALL of Texas, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, the draft of a bill exempting certain army officers from giving bonds—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law and the opinion of the court in the French spoliation cases relating to the brig *Maria*, Edward Watts, master, against The United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law and the opinion of the court in the French spoliation cases relating to the brigantine *Speedwell*, James Crawford, master, against The United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmit-

ting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the service of the Geological Survey—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the Ohio River at the head of the falls at Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Mary F. Erwin, administratrix of estate of Charlotte Jacquess, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6275) to supplement and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Grays Point, Mo.," approved January 26, 1901, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 127); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 7141, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 124) for the relief of the heirs of J. A. J. Rooker, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 128); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1093, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 125) for the relief of the estate of J. J. Walker, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 129); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3457, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 126) for the relief of the legal representatives of Dr. Thomas B. Waters, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 130); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3955, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 127) for the relief of Robert H. Holland, accompanied by a report (No. 131); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6502) granting a pension to Onslow N. McIntire—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8904) granting an increase of pension to Marion J. Barr—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 9039) to set apart certain lands in the State of South Dakota as a public park, to be known as the

Battle Mountain Sanitarium Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9040) to establish a permanent military camp ground in the vicinity of Somerset, in Somerset County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 9041) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Columbus, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9042) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Tupelo, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9043) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Corinth, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 9044) to approve the rules and regulations of the Philippine Commission, known as the "public land act"—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT (by request): A bill (H. R. 9045) to reimburse commissioned officers of Union Army for losses during service—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 9046) to provide for the erection of a public building at Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 9047) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act supplementary to the act in relation to immigration," dated March 3, 1875—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 9048) to amend an act entitled "An act to make certain grants of land to the Territory of New Mexico, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 9049) providing for the erection of a public building at Plattsmouth, Nebr., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 9050) to encourage the export trade—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9051) to encourage the export trade in drugs, chemicals, and other articles of domestic manufacture—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 9052) to revise and codify the judicial laws of the United States—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 9053) to amend an act to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at a point between Kansas City and Sibley, in Jackson County—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 9054) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements over and on East Mountain, or Hot Springs Mountain, of the Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 9055) providing for rank and pay for certain retired officers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 9056) to permit United States marshals to delegate authority to sign official checks—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON: A resolution (H. Res. 120) to pay to Eliza Deardorff, widow of John W. Deardorff, a sum equal to six months' salary and funeral expenses—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A resolution (H. Res. 121) concerning postal cars in service of railroads in the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A resolution (H. Res. 122) providing a clerk for the Committee on Labor—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BISHOP: A resolution (H. Res. 123) to pay Mabel Crump Curtiss for services rendered by her father, the late Hon. Rousseau O. Crump, of Michigan—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 124) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 7141—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee, a resolution (H. Res. 125) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 1098—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee: A resolution (H. Res. 126) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 3457—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee: A resolution (H. Res. 127) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 3955—to the Private Calendar.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 9057) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. McCullough—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 9058) granting a pension to B. Pacetty—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BASSETT: A bill (H. R. 9059) granting an increase of pension to Cephas W. Parr—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9060) granting an increase of pension to John Connors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9061) granting a pension to Henrietta A. Buell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 9062) granting a pension to John Goodspeed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9063) granting a pension to Bartlett Minot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9064) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Tidd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9065) granting an increase of pension to Albert Z. Norton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE: A bill (H. R. 9066) authorizing the President to appoint Lieut. Commander Frederick Augustus Miller, retired, United States Navy, a commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9067) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Francis Riley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9068) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of J. M. Lockry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 9069) granting an increase of pension to Edgar G. Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 9070) granting an increase of pension to Malinda J. Head—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9071) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9072) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. A. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9073) granting an increase of pension to John C. Plum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9074) granting an increase of pension to David Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9075) granting an increase of pension to Henry Snidemiller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9076) granting a pension to George H. Gaskins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9077) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church, of Hardy County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9078) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Beverly, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 9079) granting a pension to Elizabeth Davison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9080) granting an increase of pension to Simeon Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9081) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9082) granting an increase of pension to Chester F. Kimball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9083) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Wakley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9084) for the relief of Henry A. Solomon—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9085) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *H. B. Diverty* and the tug *Clara E. Uhler*—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9086) for the relief of the heirs of James Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9087) authorizing the President to appoint Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward B. Bradbury, retired, United States Navy, a lieutenant-commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 9088) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 9089) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Crab Orchard, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 9090) to provide United States registry for the steamer *Success*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9091) to provide United States registry for the steamer *Marie*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 9092) to pay D. J. Hunsucker \$218.54 and interest thereon from August 1, 1893—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9093) for the relief of Thomas Monteith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9094) for the relief of J. A. Reagan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9095) for the relief of John T. O. Wilbar—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9096) for the relief of Samuel C. Liner—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9097) granting a pension to Zebulon A. Shipman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9098) granting a pension to J. Joseph Grasty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9099) granting a pension to Adolphus Erwin Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9100) granting a pension to Sarah J. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9101) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9102) to correct the military record of H. R. Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9103) to correct the military record of Joseph S. Penland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 9104) granting an increase of pension to James F. Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9105) granting an increase of pension to Abram Rosa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 9106) to amend the military record of James C. Howard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILDEBRANT: A bill (H. R. 9107) granting a pension to Margaret F. Randolph—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9108) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth H. Hoel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9109) granting an increase of pension to Hillery W. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9110) granting an increase of pension to John L. McBeth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9111) granting an increase of pension to George Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 9112) granting a pension to Margaret J. Robbins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 9113) granting an increase of pension to William H. Covert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9114) granting an increase of pension to David Cool—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9115) granting an increase of pension to Meritt Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 9116) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9117) granting a pension to George T. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 9118) for the relief of the estate of James A. Gregory—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9119) granting a pension to Travis Glasscoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 9120) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Fox Hill, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9121) for the relief of Benjamin P. Loyall, of Norfolk, Va.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MCCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9122) granting an increase of pension to Mildred S. Ogden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9123) granting an increase of pension to William S. Underdown—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 9124) granting an increase of pension to R. F. Nugent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 9125) granting an increase of pension to William S. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9126) granting an increase of pension to John W. Riggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDER: A bill (H. R. 9127) granting a pension to Moses Schuman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 9128) for the relief of the vestry and wardens of St. Stephen's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Cedar Run Parish, Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9129) for the relief of the estate of Catharine R. Moore, deceased, late of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 9130) granting an increase of pension to Charles Van Wey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9131) for the relief of the estate of Toney Meloché—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9132) to enable the President to restore Second Lieut. Henry Ossian Flipper, United States Army, to duty, his former rank, and status in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 9133) for the relief of William Saphar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIRAS: A bill (H. R. 9134) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to John P. Barry, late first lieutenant, Battery C, Pennsylvania Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 9135) for the relief of F. R. Lauson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 9136) for the relief of Edmund F. Jenkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 9137) granting an honorable discharge to Thomas Weaver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9138) granting an increase of pension to John Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9139) granting an increase of pension to Andrew N. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9140) granting an increase of pension to James L. Capp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9141) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9142) granting an increase of pension to Capt. William F. Limpus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9143) granting an increase of pension to Emmett Langston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9144) granting an increase of pension to Elwood Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9145) granting a pension to Nannie E. Voglesong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9146) granting a pension to Lizzie A. Arthur—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9147) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Yount—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9148) granting a pension to Joseph W. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9149) granting a pension to Margaret A. McConnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9150) granting a pension to Sarah E. Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9151) granting an increase of pension to William Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9152) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Foutty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 9153) for the relief of the heirs of those killed by the explosion at Fort Lafayette, February 19, 1903—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 9154) granting an increase of pension to William Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9155) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Buck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9156) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus McWhorter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9157) granting an increase of pension to Willis Malloy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9158) granting an increase of pension to Robert Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 9159) to correct the military record of George Hollenbeck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOUTELL: Petition of citizens of Kansas and Illinois, favoring passage of House bill and Senate bill providing for higher education of the blind—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of William Raines to have his claim referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of T. J. Foster, administrator, to have claim referred to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANDLER: Memorial of the Tombigbee River Improvement Convention, of Alabama, relative to the improvement of the Tombigbee River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, praying for the enactment of laws restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, praying for the creation of a Department of Labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, praying for the improvement of the Bronx Kills—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Grand Lodge of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, praying for legislation making common carriers engaged in interstate commerce liable to their employers for injuries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of independent tobacco manufacturers, against the bills H. R. 6 and 97—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Edgar G. Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of Iron City Lodge, Brotherhood of Trainmen, favoring the passage of an eight-hour law and anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, favoring the passage of an eight-hour law and anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, papers to accompany bill H. R. 8481, granting an increase of pension to Ora S. Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Robert A. A. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Henry Snidermiller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Association, protesting against the supervision of the inspection of grain at terminal markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, No. 106, La Crosse Division, asking for more favorable conditions for the telegraphers in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, praying for the improvement of the Bronx Kills—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, letter from the Denver Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club, to enact legislation that will rehabilitate the merchant marine of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial from citizens of Fountain City, Wis., urging improvement of the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of the memorial and executive committee, Grand Army of the Republic, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, in opposition to bill H. R. 3573, providing for a board for the protection of children and animals—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Paint, Oil, and Varnish Club, urging legislation to protect trade-marks in Cuba—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Association, protesting against inspecting of grain at terminal markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the New York Preachers' Meeting, relative to the treatment of naval chaplains regarding uniforms, etc.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, favoring the improvement of the Bronx Kills—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: Petition of H. N. Hart, sole heir of John S. Hart, praying reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Papers to accompany bill to grant United States register to steamship *Marie*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, papers to accompany bill providing for a United States

registry for steamship *Success*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petition of citizens of Des Moines County, Iowa, urging improvement of the levee of the Mississippi River near Flint Creek—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of Shawhan, Boonshot & Co., and other firms and citizens of Petersburg, Ind., against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HUFF: Memorial of independent tobacco manufacturers, protesting against bills H. R. 6 and 97—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTLE: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 8783, granting increase of pension to Mary Ann Phipps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany claim of William H. Dawson; also, papers to accompany claim of Robert A. Dickson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Resolution of San Luis Obispo County Board of Trade, favoring the passage of bill H. R. 1970—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of William McKinley Council, No. 48, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Stockton, Cal., relating to immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PORTER: Resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Association, protesting against inspection of grain by the Government at terminal markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of George Yocum Post, No. 325, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany claim of Susan McBroom; also, papers to accompany claim of James Smithers; also, papers to accompany claim of Hezekiah Balch; also, papers to accompany claim of Milla Beaver, administratrix—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIDER: Petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, favoring improvement of the Bronx Kills—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the National German-American Alliance, against passage of the Hepburn interstate liquor bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of a committee of Sunday-school editors and publishers, protesting against higher postal rates on Sunday-school publications—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the independent tobacco manufacturers, against passage of bills H. R. 6 and 97, relating to tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany H. R. 2256, claim of John Mann—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Memorial of the independent tobacco manufacturers, against passage of bills H. R. 6 and 97, amending section 3394 of the Revised Statutes, relating to tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the New York Preachers' Meeting, relating to the treatment of naval chaplains regarding uniform, etc.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, urging passage of certain bills for the improvement of the Bronx Kills—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Association, relating to the inspection of grain at terminal markets by the Government—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the memorial and executive committee, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: Resolutions of Vance Post, No. 680, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic; also, resolutions of Joseph Rath Post, No. 402, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic; also, resolutions of Phil Hendrix Post, No. 201, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petitions of the German St. Mary's Young Ladies' Society, the German Christian Mothers' Society, and the St. Aloysius Young Men Verein, all of Muenster, Cooke County, Tex., in opposition to the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNOCK: Resolution of L. A. Myers Post, Grand Army of the Republic, No. 582, Department of Ohio, favoring passage of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Papers to accompany claim of Emma S. Lewis—to the Committee on War Claims.